R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 969 UD 004 464

REPORT ON OFFICE OF EDUCATION ANALYSIS OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION (DHEW), WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE JAN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.04 24P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EVALUATION, *RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, *URBAN SCHOOLS, *BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, *INTEGRATION METHODS, NEGROES, VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, APPRENTICESHIPS, OPEN ENROLLMENT, SCHOOL ZONING, NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL POLICY, TEACHING ASSIGNMENT, TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, TRANSFER POLICY, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THIS REPORT OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION (OE), PREPARED IN RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS BY CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, COMMUNITY GROUPS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL DISCRIMINATION, DISCUSSES SOME SERIOUS CONDITIONS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS WHICH MAY BE VIOLATIONS OF TITLE VI OF THE 1964 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, AND WHICH OE ORDERS THE CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION TO RECTIFY. THE REPORT FOCUSES ON THE AREAS OF THE APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS, OPEN ENROLLMENT FOR VOCATIONAL AND TRADE SCHOOLS, ZONING AND STUDENT ASSIGNMENT POLICIES, AND TEACHER PLACEMENT. IT IS REPORTED THAT DESPITE ASSURANCES AND AGREEMENTS TO IMPROVE THE DISCRIMINATORY CONDITIONS, PROGRESS HAS BEEN INSUFFICIENT. APPRENTICE RECRUITMENT AND EXAMINATION METHODS FOR INDENTURESHIPS IN THE BUILDING TRADES HAVE NOT OPENED ENOUGH POSITIONS TO NEGROES, OPEN ENROLLMENT POLICIES HAVE NOT BEEN EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENTED, AND SCHOOLS ARE STILL STRIKINGLY SEGREGATED MAINLY BECAUSE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL POLICY. DISCRIMINATORY TEACHER ASSIGNMENT PATTERNS ARE PREVALENT, WITH NEGRO TEACHERS AND THOSE WITH TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION AND LOWER QUALIFICATIONS MOSTLY PLACED IN NEGRO SCHOOLS. OE RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF EDUCATION EXERCISE MUCH GREATER AUTHORITY TO ASSURE NONDISCRIMINATORY POLICIES AND PRACTICES. THE BOARD, THE MAYOR, THE BUILDING TRADES, AND FEDERAL AGENCIES SHOULD PLAN AND IMPLEMENT WITHIN A SPECIFIC TIME MORE EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION PROGRAMS IN ALL THESE AREAS. A LIST OF SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOLLOWS THE REPORT. (NH)

4464

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

JAN 6 1967

Dear Mr. Redmond:

The enclosed document is a report of the findings of the United States Office of Education in regard to complaints received in the Office concerning practices related to the education of minority group children in the Chicago Public Schools.

In this report we identify a number of problems which the Chicago Board of Education should face, and we make a series of recommendations for action by the Board. For your convenience, we have enclosed at the end of the report a summary of these recommendations. I want to make it clear that these recommendations constitute our judgment of the solutions the Board should seek. Perhaps the Board will find alternative approaches which will result in solving the problems we have identified. It should feel free to do so.

Our report outlines serious conditions in the Chicago schools which, in our view, may involve violations of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. We believe that the constructive way to proceed is to seek your cooperation in moving rapidly to correct the conditions outlined in the report. If that can be done, we will bring about by voluntary means the changes which enforcement procedures under Title VI might take much longer to produce.

Let me add that some of the data on which this report is based were collected by us or reported to us some months ago. Consequently, some of the information may be out of date. In addition, I am aware that you have been moving toward solutions to some of the issues raised in this report. To the extent that problems we have raised have already been solved, we want to recognize the progress Chicago has made, and we would be glad to receive reports from you on this progress at any time.

We ask that the Board provide a progress report on the resolution of these problems by April 1, 1967. If the Board wishes to adopt alternative measures rather than those recommended in our report, we would like to be informed as soon as such a decision is made.

Please advise me of any assistance I can provide in connection with this letter and its enclosure.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Howe II
U.S. Commissioner of Education

Mr. James F. Redmond
General Superintendent of Schools
Board of Education
City of Chicago
228 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Enclosures

cc: Honorable Ray Page

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

5103932

JANUARY 1967

04464

ED015969

REPORT ON OFFICE OF EDUCATION ANALYSIS OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

This is a statement of findings and recommendations by the U. S. Office of Education in its analysis of certain aspects of the Chicago Public Schools under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The report also contains recommendations for dealing with a number of other educational problems which have been identified during the investigation.

The Chicago Board of Education sent a report to the Office of Education on December 13, 1965, detailing the action taken in carrying out the assurances given in its agreement of October 5, 1965. Secretary Gardner replied in a letter of December 29 that the report, although it gave evidence of some progress, left other problems unresolved, and he requested that the Board direct the General Superintendent to cooperate with a staff team from this Office which he had assigned to travel to Chicago. This team and Assistant Commissioner David Seeley arrived in Chicago January 3, 1966. Mr. Seeley met with the Board and the General Superintendent, and members of the team stayed in Chicago several weeks and met with the General Superintendent and his staff on two occasions, in January and February. Finally, the team, augmented by several specialists, returned to Chicago at the end of June 1966, meeting with the General Superintendent and members of his staff over a three-day period.

Since January 1966, the staff has been studying official reports and other materials supplied by the General Superintendent. They have analyzed

UD 004 464

these data, including maps showing school attendance boundaries. This report contains our findings and conclusions reached as a result of this analysis and of the several points outlined above. In large part this report responds to complaints transmitted to the Office of Education from the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations on July 4, 1965, and supplemented on December 9, 1965. Its recommendations seek to alleviate some of the conditions mentioned in those complaints and judged to be of legitimate concern as the result of investigation.

This report concerns the three areas covered by assurances in the October 5, 1965, agreement; apprenticeship training programs, open enrollment for vocational and trade schools, and boundaries and student assignment policies. We have also included a section stating our findings regarding some aspects of the teacher assignment question. Other elements of the complaint are not here reported on.

I. APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS

In his letter to the President of the Chicago Board of Education, dated December 29, 1965, Secretary Gardner stated that he considered Mayor Daley's city-wide program to increase apprenticeship training opportunities for minority youth in the building and construction trades to be an acceptable start in improving the access of all pupils to union apprenticeship programs at Washburne Trade School. These programs were covered by the October 5, 1965 agreement between President Whiston and Under Secretary Cohen. The result of this program based on very recent

information indicates that it is beginning to produce some positive results in the manner intended. There can be further strengthening in the manner of operation so that it can become a more effective means for opening opportunity in the apprentice training programs operated by the Chicago public schools.

We have been informed that from December 1965 through December 1966 about 100 Negroes have been indentured in building and construction trades represented at Washburne Trade School. This is a considerable increase from the number of Negroes indentured in previous years.

According to the latest report, all trades represented at Washburne have indentured Negro apprentices. There has been a breakthrough in several unions that had not previously indentured any Negro apprentices, and the number of Negroes attending Washburne has increased during the past year. Clearly, there has been progress, but it should be considered only a start.

We are aware that there are many factors which make it difficult to increase the pace at which qualified minority youth can be indentured and enrolled in apprenticeship programs. Nevertheless, there is wide agreement among Federal and local officials acquainted with the Mayor's program that union, employer, and the public school participants can exert the kinds of efforts required to make it fully succeed.

We wish to call the Board's attention to an area which is specifically relevant to these problems and which our investigation has shown to be a

source of considerable discontent among officials and citizens concerned with apprentice and training programs. This is the broad area of apprentice recruitment including the examination and selection procedures. For example, it is alleged that the dates of up-coming examinations are not announced in an open and timely fashion; that for some trades the examinations themselves are designed to impose unreasonable and artificial barriers to some potential candidates; that the availability of applications for examinations is restricted to preferred candidates; and that final selection from the list of eligible candidates is not in order of merit. No effective solution will be found unless some procedures can be developed for Negro and other disadvantaged youth which will substitute for the informal and traditional processes by which many are now apprenticed.

Whether or not these charges are valid, the frequency of their occurrence and the qualifications of those who make them in themselves constitute a serious problem. People <u>believe</u> that there is no use trying to get into certain unions. Under these circumstances the School Board should take special pains to make sure that the procedures for recruitment, examination and selection are above suspicion.

We are aware that members of the school system staff already attend some joint apprenticeship council meetings where final selection of apprentices is made. It would appear that the business of at least some of these meetings may be simply to formalize nomination of candidates already selected. One of our proposals, which follows, is aimed at

developing a systematic method for observation of all stages in the indenturing process so that any preferential or subjective practices can be identified more readily.

In view of the mutual interest and responsibility of the Board and the U.S. Office of Education for dealing with the above problems, we propose:

1. A statement by the Board to the joint apprenticeship councils with trades represented in the Chicago public schools that the present number of Negroes admitted to apprenticeship programs is no more than a first step in creating opportunity in these programs.

2. A thorough review to determine within the shortest possible time how to carry out the Mayor's program more effectively. The review should include the following: (a) an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the program so far, and (b) recommendations for improvements. We recommend that such a review explore not only the implementation of the Mayor's program, but also the various ways by which young men usually become apprenticed in various trades. The report should be submitted to the Board, the U.S. Office of Education and shared with the Mayor's office, so that we may determine whether the program can continue to furnish the basis for satisfaction by the Board of its commitment to resolve the problem of limited opportunities at the Washburne Trade School. These facts have been communicated to the Department of Labor which shares our concerns. The Department of Labor has agreed to undertake immediately a thorough review of this program.

3. Agreement by the Board, this Office and U.S. Department of Labor representatives, after the review, on the specific steps to carry

out the program more effectively. This would include a timetable, made flexible to apply to the different circumstances of the respective trades, for increasing minority representation. The councils should be informed of their specific responsibilities and the Board should periodically review performance. If it finds that inadequate performance by any council is attributable to a failure to carry out its obligations under the program, including lack of cooperation with other parties to the program, the Board should invoke its resolution of July 14, 1965, and declare that trade ineligible to enter new apprenticeship classes in schools operated by the Chicago Board of Education.

4. So long as it is believed that preferential recruitment, examination and selection procedures operate, allegations of discrimination will continue which in themselves will dissuade Negro youth from making applications. In order to establish public confidence in the fairness of the admission procedures, a qualified and objective observer should attend all council activities which are relevant to the indenturing process.

5. The Board instruct its staff to develop a long-term program to help minority youth (a) know about apprenticeship opportunities, and (b) qualify for them. Such a program is needed to serve as a substitute for the family orientation, encouragement, coaching and help which, in effect, give preferred access to apprenticeship training

to certain youth. We are aware that the school administration has already taken certain steps along the lines proposed here.

II. OPEN ENROLLMENT FOR VOCATIONAL AND TRADE SCHOOLS

In its report to the U.S. Office of Education submitted on December 13, 1965, the Board stated that (a) its staff was preparing a report regarding open enrollment in vocational schools and (b) the Board had reiterated its August 12, 1964 policy concerning city-wide, open enrollment in these schools. This is the extent, of the action taken by the Board with regard to Paragraph two of the October 5, 1965 agreement.

We propose that specialists from this Office meet with the Board or its representatives to discuss procedures already in effect and such additional ones as may be jointly agreed upon for making the city-wide, open enrollment policy effective. The information already received from the General Superintendent, and any additional data which might be found necessary, could serve as the starting point for our discussions.

III. BOUNDARIES AND STUDENT ASSIGNMENT POLICIES

As is well known in Chicago, the facts concerning student assignment in the Chicago public schools are that, by and large, Negro and white students go to separate schools. Data supplied by the Board of Education ("Teacher Observation Head Count" for October 8, 1965), show that during the 1965-66 school year 85.3 per cent of white elementary

and secondary students attended white-segregated schools; *that 87.8 per cent of Negro elementary and secondary students attended Negro-segregated schools; and that only 12.8 per cent of Chicago's elementary and secondary students in puplic schools attended integrated schools. The degree of separation in elementary schools alone is even more striking. According to our analysis, 87.9 per cent of white and 90.3 per cent of Negro elementary students were assigned to segregated schools during the past school year. The vast preponderance of the separation is related to separation in housing patterns.

This is not the first time that the extreme separation of children by race in the Chicago public schools has been reported, and there is every indication that the situation may get worse. Such separation impairs education and Board policies need to be responsive to that fact. A fruitful response to this question has always been a major problem.

* For the purpose of its analysis of the Chicago school system, the Office of Education adopted the definition of an "integrated" school used by the Chicago Board's Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools, viz., only those schools with at least 10 per cent Negro and 10 per cent white students. Schools with over 90 per cent Negro students are considered Negro-segregated; those with white, or combined white and "other," enrollments of more than 90 per cent are considered white-segregated.

Only (1) regular elementary schools and their branches and (2) general high schools and their branches have been included in our statistical analyses of student assignment and of teacher assignment in section IV. The only exception to this rule is our exclusion from the general high school category of Lane Technical High School, Lindblom General and Technical High School, Tilden Technical and General High School, and Holden Branch of Tilden.

In studying the data presently available to us we have been impressed with the complexity involved in sorting out the factors underlying the establishment of a particular boundary or group of boundaries, the choice of new school sites or the location of school branches. Based on the present stage of our study in this area, we do not say that the determination of the present school attendance boundaries was designed to promote racial segregation. However, it is our conclusion that it probably would not be possible to explain fully the selection and establishment of certain of the sites and boundaries which we have studied to date by factors which do not include race. Furthermore, it may be said without reservation that at the very least the effect of the way Chicago has implemented its neighborhood school policy has sometimes been to preserve segregation unnecessarily or to fail to reduce segregation when feasible.

On the basis of our analysis thus far, we share the conclusion reached by the Board's Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools and other observers that by far the greater part of the segregation in Chicago's public schools results from residential segregation combined with the Board's neighborhood school policy.

We recommend that the Board engage competent specialists to assist them in preparing a plan appropriate to Chicago, drawing on the wide range of administrative remedies which have been adopted by other school districts to lessen segregated education and, indeed, to reverse trends of increasing segregation where possible. As the Board is aware, a number of different steps are being proposed to deal with this problem.

But no particular action is alone sufficient for a metropolitan center. A combination of actions over time is needed; commitment in fact by school authorities to the goal of reducing segregation in education is fundamental.

The U.S. Office of Education will provide all possible assistance and support in this matter, but we reiterate on recommendation that specialist services are necessary to work on this problem.

IV. FACULTY ASSIGNMENT PATTERNS

In addition to the foregoing on questions covered by the October 5, 1965 agreement, some findings regarding teacher assignment by race and by type of certificate can also be presented at this time. Our analysis is based on interviews with school administrative officials, observation of the assignment process, and a head count of teachers by race conducted at our request.

Clear-cut patterns emerge from our analysis, showing that (1) Negro teachers are very heavily concentrated in the "Negro-segregated" schools, and (2) the proportion of temporarily certificated teachers assigned to Negro-segregated schools is significantly higher than at "white-segregated" schools. Our findings are substantially the same as reported in other studies.

According to our calculation, *89.8 per cent of Negro teachers are assigned to Negro-segregated schools. Negro faculty segregation is greater

* See footnote on page 8, section III of this report for definitions and schools excluded from our analysis.

at the elementary level, 92.2 per cent, than in high schools where the figure is 79.7 per cent. We found that of the 259 white-segregated, regular elementary schools and branches, 222 had no Negro teachers; and of the 188 Negro-segregated, regular elementary schools and branches, 14 had no white teachers. All of the 15 Negro-segregated, general high schools and branches had some white teachers, but 23 of the 43 white-segregated, general high schools and branches had no Negro teachers. According to our analysis of information dated February 15, 1966, and received from the school administration, 20 of the 23 Negro principals of Chicago elementary and high schools were assigned to Negro-segregated schools. The same report showed that four Negroes were serving as superintendents of administrative districts; three of these four districts are predominantly Negro, while one is integrated.

We found that while 37.6 per cent of the teachers at Negro-segregated schools had temporary certificates, only 11.5 per cent of those at white-segregated schools held temporary certificates.

Summarizing, we note the following principal differences between the two types of certificates: (1) entry requirements for regularly certificated status are more rigorous, demanding written and oral examinations not required for temporary certification; (2) at the elementary level, fewer total professional course hours and fewer prescribed professional courses are required for temporary certification; (3) at the high school level, fewer courses in the teacher's field of specialization are required for temporary certification; (4) at both levels, supervised teaching

experience is required for regular certification, but no similar requirement is specified for temporary certification. Finally, we note the school system's own policy of granting annual salary increases to regularly certificated teachers but not to those with temporary certificates.

We recognize that some extremely able teachers may hold temporary certificates. Nevertheless the policies of the Board itself indicate that, for the city as a whole, certification through examination, superior professional preparation, and greater experience are aimed to produce the quality of teachers it desires to attract and promote. All policies and procedures concerning teaching personnel indicate that regularly certified teachers are viewed as more qualified.

The above-reported finding on the uneven distribution of temporarily certificated teachers as between white and Negro-segregated schools is based on an official Board report. We have attempted to obtain from school officials data on other aspects of teacher qualifications and faculty assignment patterns, including years of experience and academic degrees held, the extent of teacher misassignment and teacher turnover, and the prevalence of classes without a teacher, regular or substitute. This data was recently received and is in the process of analysis. The complaints we have received and a number of Chicago citizens who have volunteered information to our investigating team have alleged that Negro students are being deprived of equal opportunity as a result of school practices in these areas. It can be noted that the findings of the Board's Advisory Panel on Integration of

the Public Schools substantiate, for an earlier period, the allegation that less qualified teachers are being assigned to Negro schools. In its March 31, 1964 report, the Panel states (p.18) that, based on sample data, it found that in comparisons of Negro with white schools, the former have smaller proportions both of teachers with at least five years of experience and teachers with Master's degrees. The report also states (p.74) that the faculty turnover in Negro schools is "much higher." On the question of classes "uncovered" by either regularly assigned or substitute teachers, complaints we have received cite a survey conducted by the Chicago Teachers' Union in April 1965 which shows that the incidence of uncovered classes is much higher in Negro than in white schools. We note the same thing based on preliminary data and observation of records.

Certain comments must also be made on the cause and effect relationship between Chicago's teacher assignment policies on one hand, and the existing teacher assignment patterns on the other. On this critical issue the current assignment and transfer policies in combination with other factors have played a major role, if not the chief role, in bringing about and maintaining these patterns. The concentration of Negro teachers and the placement of teachers with inferior qualifications in Negro-segregated schools is the natural consequence that must be expected from the policies and practices now in effect.

A detailed discussion of the teacher assignment process is not possible here. We do not have complete data, and according to school officials, no complete description exists. Nevertheless, some comments on the process are in order.

The basis fact which emerges from our analysis is that the school administration has exercised little authority in assigning staff at its own discretion, to spread the range of talents, age, experience, training, and specialization among its different schools. It appears that the Personnel Office, for example, has little responsibility to effectively staff a newly opened school, or to prevent or remedy the deterioration of a faculty in another. In Chicago, the more qualified teachers in rank order have first choice when assigned initially to fill most vacancies, by virtue of the rule that regularly certificated teachers have preference over substitute teachers in selecting positions from the list of schools with vacancies.

As regards the transfer policy, a similar commentary can be made, i.e. only the better qualified teachers (those with regular certification) are eligible to transfer under the policy. The less qualified teachers (temporarily certificated, or substitute teachers) do not have similar transfer rights. Moreover, the school administration exercised no control over the transfer process other than in requiring that transferees be qualified to teach the appropriate grade level and subject. Teachers choose the schools to which they transfer. This means that in processing a transfer of staff a range with respect to experience, training, age, etc. will normally not be taken into account in either the transferee's new or old school. According to the "Teacher's Handbook," the one exception to this rule is the freeze on transfers to schools whose staffs consist 95 per cent or more of teachers with four or more years of experience.

To understand the practical effect of these policies, they must be viewed against the existence in Chicago of "desirable" and "less desirable" schools as seen by those considering assignment. This is especially relevant in a context where individual preference plays such an important part in determining teachers' assignments. In summary, we find that in Chicago, while the School Board controls the mechanics of the assignment process, it appears to have accepted little responsibility for the results of the process.

We wish to cite one of the conclusions from a report entitled "Equality of Educational Opportunity" released July 2, 1966 by this Office. The report, which summarizes the findings of a national survey conducted by this Office, underlines our concern and, we are sure, that of the Board for achieving equal opportunity in this vital area. The following is excerpted from P. 22 of the report: "The quality of teachers shows a stronger relationship to pupil achievement" than do variations in facilities or curriculums. "Furthermore, it is progressively greater at higher grades, indicating a cumulative impact of the qualities of teachers in a school on the pupils' achievement. Again, teacher quality is more important for minority pupil achievement than for that of the majority."

Four principal actions are needed to modify the faculty assignment patterns discussed above. The Board should:

(1) Assume much greater responsibility regarding teacher assignment.

(2) Increase the proportion of experienced teachers in

disadvantaged schools. This could include limiting, more than is done under current Board policy, the transfer of experienced teachers to those schools already having a high proportion of experienced teachers.

(3) Define what are the characteristics as seen by teachers which distinguish "desirable" from "less desirable" schools. Once these factors have been identified, work toward equalizing those conditions susceptible of change. A broad program of special incentives, as recommended by the Board's Advisory Panel on Integration, for attracting teachers to the so-called problem schools should be considered.

(4) Emphasize to school staff and citizens alike that the Board is genuinely committed to solving any problems of inequality in staffing patterns which may be found in the city's schools. This is admittedly a difficult concept to define and administer, but nonetheless crucial. It would certainly include affirmative action along the lines of the three preceding recommendations. In the end, the Board's commitment to this goal could only be judged by the thoroughness with which it faced the problem, and its performance in taking effective action as called for by its findings.

In recognition of the complexity of the task and the need to take special local conditions into account we will not at this time attempt to define specific steps or procedures for eliminating the observed inequities between Negro-segregated and white-segregated schools. We do propose that the Board draw up its own plans, including timetables for implementation, for (1) achieving a reasonable spread in faculty

qualifications among schools, and the elimination of other disparities found to exist with respect to faculty as between schools attended wholly or predominantly by white and Negro students, and (2) lessening concentrations of teachers and other professional staff members of one race at schools where all or a majority of students are of the same race. The Office of Education would be happy to furnish whatever assistance it can in drawing up these plans. The Board can also secure outside experts to help with drawing up the plans. We strongly urge that representatives of teacher groups in the system be included in the planning. Many teachers in the system have expressed their concern about the unequal educational opportunities in Chicago, and they must play an important role in solving the problem.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON CHICAGO
(Taken from text of the report)

JANUARY 1967

I. APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. A statement by the Board to the joint apprenticeship councils with trades represented in the Chicago public schools that the present number of Negroes admitted to apprenticeship programs is no more than a first step in creating opportunity in these programs.

2. A thorough review to determine within the shortest possible time how to carry out the Mayor's program more effectively. The review should include the following: (a) an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the program so far, and (b) recommendations for improvements. We recommend that such a review explore not only the implementation of the Mayor's program, but also the various ways by which young men usually become apprenticed in various trades. The report should be submitted to the Board, the U.S. Office of Education and shared with the Mayor's office, so that we may determine whether the program can continue to furnish the basis for satisfaction by the Board of its commitment to resolve the problem of limited opportunities at the Washburne Trade School. These facts have been communicated to the Department of Labor which shares our concerns. The Department of Labor has agreed to undertake immediately a thorough review of this program.

3. Agreement by the Board, this Office and U.S. Department of Labor representatives, after the review, on the specific steps to carry out the program more effectively. This would include a timetable, made flexible to apply to the different circumstances of the respective trades, for increasing minority representation. The councils should be informed of their specific responsibilities and the Board should periodically

review performance. If it finds that inadequate performance by any council is attributable to a failure to carry out its obligations under the program, including lack of cooperation with other parties to the program, the Board should invoke its resolution of July 14, 1965, and declare that trade ineligible to enter new apprenticeship classes in schools operated by the Chicago Board of Education.

4. So long as it is believed that preferential recruitment, examination and selection procedures operate, allegations of discrimination will continue which in themselves will dissuade Negro youth from making applications. In order to establish public confidence in the fairness of the admission procedures, a qualified and objective observer should attend all council activities which are relevant to the indenturing process.

5. The Board instruct its staff to develop a long-term program to help minority youth (a) know about apprenticeship opportunities, and (b) qualify for them. Such a program is needed to serve as a substitute for the family orientation, encouragement, coaching and help which, in effect, give preferred access to apprenticeship training to certain youth. We are aware that the school administration has already taken certain steps along the lines proposed here.

II. OPEN ENROLLMENT FOR VOCATIONAL AND TRADE SCHOOLS

We propose that specialists from this Office meet with the Board or its representatives to discuss procedures already in effect and such additional ones as may be jointly agreed upon for making the city-wide, open enrollment

policy effective. The information already received from the General Superintendent, and any additional data which might be found necessary, could serve as the starting point for our discussions.

III. BOUNDARIES AND STUDENT ASSIGNMENT POLICIES

We recommend that the Board engage competent specialists to assist them in preparing a plan appropriate to Chicago, drawing on the wide range of administrative remedies which have been adopted by other school districts to lessen segregated education and, indeed, to reverse trends of increasing segregation where possible. As the Board is aware, a number of different steps are being proposed to deal with this problem. But no particular action is alone sufficient for a metropolitan center. A combination of actions over time is needed; commitment in fact by school authorities to the goal of reducing segregation in education is fundamental.

IV. FACULTY ASSIGNMENT PATTERNS

1. Assume much greater responsibility regarding teacher assignment.

2. Increase the proportion of experienced teachers in disadvantage schools. This could include limiting, more than is done under current Board policy, the transfer of experienced teachers to those schools already having a high proportion of experienced teachers.

3. Define what are the characteristics as seen by teachers which distinquish "desirable" from "less desirable" schools. Once these factors have been identified, work toward equalizing those conditions susceptible of change. A

broad program of special incentives, as recommended by the Board's Advisory Panel on Integration, for attracting teachers to the so-called problem schools should be considered.

4. Emphasize to school staff and citizens alike that the Board is genuinely committed to solving any problems of inequality in staffing patterns which may be found in the city's schools.